

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present Amendment, the claims in the application are claims 1-36. Claims 34-36 are new. Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of new claims 34-36 is fully supported in the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a document by Computergram International (hereinafter "Computergram"). In response to the rejection, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based upon the following.

Claim 1 recites a method including receiving a consumer-initiated request having a domain name that identifies goods/services without identifying a specific provider thereof, selecting a provider name and forwarding same to the consumer. Applicant respectfully submits that the Computergram reference fails to disclose any particulars of a method other than the brief mentioning of aliasing systems by Netword and Centraal that merely match keywords provided by consumers to URLs. It is noted that the Computergram reference identifies a U.S. Patent to Netword, a copy of which is enclosed herewith as part of IDS documentation submitted to the Patent Office. The patent to Netword (hereinafter the "Netword patent") discloses the particulars of the Netword system. The Netword system is an aliasing system in which a nickname identifying both a product/service and the provider thereof is matched to a URL. In particular, the Netword systems allows consumers to provide resource aliases which describe a desired resources in a mnemonically meaningful way (col. 4, lines 53-54 of the Netword patent). Each resource alias includes a source alias that

uniquely describes and denotes the owner, source or distributor of the resource (col. 4, lines 61-63). Having received a resource alias, the Netword system utilizes at least one lookup table to identify a corresponding URL.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Computergram reference nor the Netword patent shows or even suggests a method including receiving a request having a domain name that identifies goods/services without identifying a specific provider thereof. Instead, the Computergram reference is altogether silent as to the contents or use of a consumer-initiated request, and the Netword patent contrastingly discloses the use of specific provider information in consumer-initiated requests. In an absence of any prior teaching or suggestion of a method as claimed in claim 1, claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be unanticipated by and allowable over the Computergram reference and the corresponding Netword patent.

Claims 2, 20 and 28 recite that the domain name element is represented as INEEDSUBJECT.XXX. It is clear that the Computergram reference fails to show a domain name element in a consumer-initiated request as claimed in claims 2, 20 and 28. In addition, the Netword patent also fails to show a domain name element as claimed. Instead, the consumer-initiated request discussed in the Netword patent includes a resource alias appearing to have the form "provider/product or service" (col. 5, lines 3-31). It cannot be said that the Netword patent even remotely suggests the domain name element structure as recited in claims 2, 20 and 28. In an absence of any prior teaching or suggestion of an invention as recited in claims 2, 20 and 28, claims

2, 20 and 28 are believed to be unanticipated by and allowable over the Computergram reference and the corresponding Netword patent.

Claims 5 recites providing comparative pricing and availability information about goods/services offered by the at least one provider selected. Clearly, any discussion of a method/system by the Computergram reference is scant at best. It cannot be said that the Computergram reference in any way shows the providing step of claim 5. The Netword patent also fails to show or suggest providing comparative pricing and availability information. In an absence of any prior teaching or suggestion of the providing step of claim 5, claim 5 is believed to be unanticipated by and allowable over the Computergram reference and the corresponding Netword patent.

Claim 8 recites the step of storing information associated with the consumer including personal preferences, payment instructions and privacy instructions. Clearly, the Computergram reference fails to show or even remotely suggest the storing step of claim 8. It appears that the Netword patent is also altogether silent as to storing consumer information, much less storing the consumer information recited in claim 8. As a result, claim 8 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be unanticipated and allowable.

Claim 10 recites enabling the consumer to identify goods/services offered by the selected provider in accordance with privacy instructions. Clearly, the Computergram references fails to suggest the recited enabling step in any way. The Netword patent also appears to fail to suggest the recited enabling step. Consequently, claim 10

and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be unanticipated and allowable.

Claim 18 recites a database of consumer information and a server having a name linking module for selecting at least one provider name in response to the consumer request and based upon the consumer information. Applicant respectfully submits that the Computergram reference fails to show or even suggest a module for selecting at least one provider name both in response to the recited request and based upon the consumer information. Likewise, the Netword patent fails to show or even suggest use of stored consumer information in selecting a provider name. Instead, only the above-described resource alias (identifying the provider and the product/service) is used to select a URL (steps 508, 510, 513 and 516 of Fig. 5). In an absence of any prior teaching or suggestion of the method of claim 18, claim 18 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be allowable over the references of record.

Claim 25 recites a method including selecting, responsive to the received request and based upon stored consumer information, at least one provider. As stated above with respect to claim 18, the Computergram reference fails to show or even suggest selecting at least one provider both in response to the recited request and based upon the consumer information. In addition, the Netword patent fails to show or even suggest use of stored consumer information in selecting a provider, as explained above. As a result, claim 25 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be allowable.

Claim 26 recites enabling the identification of goods/services using privacy instructions and enabling a consumer purchase in accordance with stored payment instructions. The Computergram reference fails to altogether suggest a method of claim 26. The Netword patent also appears to fail to mention the enabling steps of claim 26. Claim 26 and the claims that depend therefrom are therefore believed to be unanticipated and allowable.

New claims 34-36 depend from claims 1 and 18 and are therefore believed to be allowably at least for the reasons stated above with respect to their respective independent claims.

Marked up versions of amended claims 1, 18 and 25 showing all the changes relative to the previous version of such claims appear above. Attached to the present Amendment as an appendix is a clean copy of claims 1, 18 and 25 as amended.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in a condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully requested.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.



William F. Esser  
Reg. No. 38,053

Date: \_\_November 5, 2001\_\_

Jenkins & Gilchrist  
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200  
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799  
214/855-4181  
214/855-4300 (fax)